



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

beheld some years ago when the Samoa question was agitated.

Samoa did not concern us at all — but a United States admiral was found to make himself infamously ridiculous by haranguing a mob in San Francisco on the ease with which Germany could be crushed by setting Russia and France on her.

In the present case the United States set up as the champions of the Monroe doctrine. It is assumed that Britain wants to take additional territory which does not by right belong to her. Therefore, as she refuses arbitration, a hundred thousand dollar commission is to be sent to Venezuela, to do what? — to settle the question? — no such *ex parte* investigation can settle it, — hence, not to settle it, but only to show England that she must expect the United States to stand by Venezuela in a fight with her!

That commission can mean nothing else. But, if it means this, is not this adding fuel to fire, by making both Venezuela and England less inclined to come to a peaceful understanding? And would not arbitration be just as far off as it is now!

It seems to me, there can be question about this. The action of the President strengthens the Venezuelan war party — it also strengthens the British war party, and we have seen what effect it has had on the champions of war in our own country.

This is not statesmanship. Nothing is more certain than that England will not go to war with us, unless she is driven to it by the advocates of war in this country. England has *not* consciously violated the Monroe doctrine. She has accepted by treaty the independence and integrity of all American states. The British Parliament, this may be readily admitted, would not furnish the means to any government that would wantonly try to deprive any organized state of any part of its territory. Hence, there being absence of *intention*, there is, according to a universally accepted principle in law, no crime, no — *dolus*. Therefore, as the editor of the *Advocate* has before said, this is a proper subject for arbitration, and if the United States firmly insist on such a solution — not by yard long dispatches, but in a brief statement to the effect that we must regard a refusal to submit to arbitration as an unfriendly act, adding thereto the urgent request for a settlement by arbitration, — we may feel quite sure that England would see the justice of our demands. If the present ministry should refuse, it is as good as certain that Parliament would refuse its assent to the wasting of public treasury and blood for the acquisition of a little more territory. A new ministry would then come in, and the whole matter would be amicably settled. It will be settled amicably anyhow, but the President's action has strengthened the case of the present ministry in England, as any one can readily see, if he will put the case that the same had occurred to us on the part of England.

The Monroe doctrine is a good thing, and it behooves every loyal American to stand up for it; but before accusing a foreign power of hostile intentions against the Doctrine, we should be very certain that its prime minister lies. A mistake is not a lie, and we are not even sure that there is a mistake. Supposing, Lord Salisbury is right as to the fact of boundary? Where he is unquestionably wrong is in his refusal to submit to arbitration, but the President's commission does not bring us any nearer to that, — it only gives aid and comfort to the war-howling fanatics on both sides of the ocean, and in Venezuela itself.

CHICAGO, ILL., Dec. 26, 1895.

## INTERNATIONAL LAW AND PEACE.

BY GEORGE F. MAGOUN, D.D.

A friend has sent me a printed paper read early this month at Brussels in Belgium, before the International Law Reform Congress meeting there, on "The Place of International Law in the Evolution of Peace." The author is the Secretary of the British Peace Society, W. Evans Darby, LL.D. The essay really maintains two propositions: (1) That there is something which, for want of a better, has gotten the name of "international law:" and (2) That the growth of this promotes peace between the nations of the earth. Thus stated, in plain language that all can understand, there would seem to be little ground to doubt either proposition.

But why cast a cloud, a color of doubt over it by working in a word of doubtful import itself, viz., "evolution"? The singular notion prevails that if a thing is not current in this nineteenth century it can be made so by attaching to it some new and little understood term. Just now evolution is fastened, like a new tag, upon most every thing. It has become a cant. And "of all the cants of this canting world," it is often one of the stupidest and most offensive. It is employed to induce belief in something people would have no disposition to accept but for a general leaning to Spencer's "universal hypothesis." In other cases, and this is one of them — it is simply useless, meaning nothing that is not meant fully and more accurately by the "development" or "promotion" of peace. For the prevention of conflict is, and always has been, the very object of what passes as "international law," and not something of a different nature evolved from any antecedent or antecedents of a warlike sort, as the meaning of "evolution" in this connection would necessarily be. The plain question at issue is really this: Do imposed relations between the Great Powers and advanced rules governing such relations lead to the development or promotion of peace as an outgrowth of one great permanent principle — that peace is always better than war?

"The Codification of the Law of Nations," of which such a statesman as Charles Sumner did not despair, may be realized only in a far distant future of the world's coming golden age. But this cannot be disputed, that every amelioration of laws of war and of diplomatic intercourse thus far has tended to prevent conflict and bloodshed. These reforms have gone to show (1) That wars can be forestalled, even when imminent, by a better understanding of international rights, duties and customs. (2) After their occurrence steps can be taken to prevent future wars on the same issues. (3) The possibility of wars may be still further lessened by cultivating a regard for the interests and liabilities of other nations between which variances may arise on these or similar issues. Settlements may be avoided which would jeopardize other nations at other times. So precedents for war grow fewer. For misunderstandings are prevented. All conflicts at arms are first conflicts of opinion and feeling, either between the people in conflict or their rulers.

Two questions discussed at Brussels illustrate what has been said. The extension of the three mile limit for the high seas to ten miles is a legitimate development of an old rule in the interest of peace. For within the larger sea-limit fewer collisions and misunderstandings could occur between vessels belonging to different nationalities. The other question is that of damages for injuries to

vessels and cargoes on the high seas. My friend refers to the confusion now existing as to distribution of damages as defying any rational codification of the different rules that obtain. This state of things evidently invites hostilities. And changes in the rules admitting universal understanding and compilation would as evidently prevent them.

My impression has therefore been clear and strong, ever since I attended the Law Reform Congress at Cologne in 1882, as an American delegate, that the friends of international peace wisely look to this Congress for large help in the prevention of war. Back of the movement for arbitration lies its work as to subjects involved in cases of arbitration. It seems to be the simplest fact possible that to diminish liability to international misunderstandings is to uproot a prolific cause of wars. And the simple method is to ameliorate existing rules by development of humane and Christian principles. Now and then some rule will be found so provocative of "strained relations," that no improvement in the direction of civilization and humanity is possible. Such a rule must evidently be thrown out by common consent. Abrogation, not "evolution," is the only remedy.

GRINNELL, IOWA, Oct., 1895.

### JINGOISTIC PERILS TO COMMERCE.

BY EDWARD ATKINSON.

Address at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Reform Club, Dec. 7, 1895.

Gentlemen of the Reform Club: In preparing to address you upon the jingoism which has found a lodgment in a cavity in the heads of some of our public men, I may safely assume that other speakers will have dealt with the political and moral aspect of the question; I shall, therefore, mainly devote myself to the economic side. From that standpoint, it may become manifest to you that the imbecility of the promoters of jingoism is even more in evidence than the brutal influence which they attempt to exert from the personally safe positions which most of them occupy. Some of these men appear to be moved by the desire to maintain increased taxes in order to get a pretext for heavier imposts; others appear to be actuated by a craving for notoriety, their crazy utterances giving evidence of their total lack of any real ability to deal with the great social problems of the day. There are others of some executive ability in the public service, but, as yet, of but little experience, to whom we may impute patriotic intentions, only in inverse proportion to the credit which we may give them for capacity in any public function, except, perhaps, in performing the executive duties of a chief of police.

The active jingoism of this small and feeble, but very noisy, faction is sustained by the more dangerous, but passive, support which is given them by men of pure intentions, who attained position and influence in the late great struggle for existence through which this nation passed into the full fruition of personal liberty. These are men whose intensity of feeling had become so great in dealing with the moral and ethical questions of the past that they appear to have become incapable of reasoning on the economic questions of the present. Certain men in the highest positions and of great intellectual power still hold to the medieval fallacy that in the commerce of nations what one gains another must lose, being apparently mentally incapable of mastering the simple principles of trade. They, therefore, regard all imports

from foreign countries as an evidence of a war upon our domestic industries, totally overlooking the fact that all commerce consists in mutual service, and that it cannot be sustained unless both parties secure a benefit.

Under the combined influence of these depraved, or erroneous, ideas, the true Monroe and the Adams doctrine of 1818 has been put completely out of sight, and a Monroe doctrine which is a travesty of the original grounds of President Monroe's action in relation to the republics of Central and South America is put before the people as if it had almost the sanctity of international law. One may form a very sure estimate of the motives which actuated President Monroe, without going into the lengthy history of the measures which were taken by his secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, and by himself in 1817 and 1818, for the purpose of maintaining God's peace on the long frontier between us and the neighboring Dominion of Canada. Those motives were brought into action by the simple agreement made by Mr. Adams with the foreign office of Great Britain, afterward confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and still binding upon both nations. It was agreed — and I now use the exact words — that, "in order to avoid collision and to save expense," neither the United States nor Great Britain would maintain any armed naval force upon the great lakes. Over these great lakes a peaceful commerce is now borne in the service of mankind greater than that of the Mediterranean sea. The volume of the traffic which passes through the St. Mary's canal during the seven or eight months when it is free from ice exceeds the year's traffic of the Suez canal by more than one-fifth.

If we need no "commerce destroyers" on the lakes, what need have we of such disgraceful instruments of plunder and rapine upon the ocean, over which our huge supplies of food, fuel, fibres and fabrics are borne in constantly increasing measure to supply the needs of nations, from whom we gain in exchange many of the comforts and luxuries and a few of the necessities of life? \* \* \*

The nineteenth century will be marked in history for the development of the great commerce in which men and nations serve each other's needs. In this service there are four groups, consisting of six countries, that may be classed as the machine-using nations of the world. By the application of science and invention within the century, they have been enabled to develop the mechanism of production and distribution to the mutual benefit of all whom they supply. In this labor-saving progress the wages or earnings of the mass of the people of this country have been doubled in purchasing power in thirty years; the wages in some other countries having been slightly augmented. Wealth and welfare have been alike increased in this country very rapidly; in other countries, but slowly. Had it not been for the concurrent waste of war and of preparation for war in Europe, accompanying the development of machinery, poverty might have been yet more alleviated in these machine-using countries hereafter named than it has been, while pauperism might have been wholly abated or made exceptional in the cases of the incapable only. In Great Britain it has been reduced one-half in recent years.

At the head of this group of machine-using nations stand the people of the United States; next Great Britain; next France, and lastly Germany, Belgium and Holland. In these four groups will be found about one-seventh of the population of the globe, numbering at some point in 1896 about 216,000,000 persons, one-third